



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. VIII, 2.

WHOLE NO. 30.

I.—SPEECH MIXTURE IN FRENCH CANADA.

A.—INDIAN AND FRENCH.

In Canada, at different periods of her history, we find all those causes existing that produce speech mixture in its various degrees, from the union of two wholly divergent idioms, as in the case of the French and Indian, down through forms of language that are more or less closely related according as they belong to the same general stock, or are contained, as special varieties, within the domain of a single common type. The conditions, furthermore, of antagonistic racial differences, of incompatible stages of civilization, of strong variations of traditional culture, of divergence of social customs, of well-marked and persistent dialect varieties, give to the problem here a many-sidedness and a kaleidoscopic coloring which are indicative, from the beginning, of its complex nature.

When the French first landed on the shores of the St. Lawrence, two great families of native speech occupied the region to the northeast of the American continent, namely, the Algonkin tribes, with their sundry dialects and sub-dialects, and the Iroquois (the Five Nations), whose generic language was in its turn divided into different species, of which the Huron was the chief representative. It was this Huron-Iroquois that prevailed in great measure throughout the district that afterwards became La Nouvelle France. In support of this statement I would appeal to the judgment of a celebrated missionary and writer, Jean André Cuoq, who for twenty years labored among the Iroquois and Algonkin tribes of Quebec: "Quelques auteurs ont pensé que les sauvages que rencontra Jacq. Cartier à Stadaconé et à Hochelaga, étaient de

race *algonquine*. C'est là une erreur que démontre la seule inspection des mots sauvages dont le célèbre navigateur nous a conservé le vocabulaire. Ce vocabulaire peu considérable, il est vrai, mais pourtant bien précieux, comprend deux listes de mots, la liste qu'il dressa dans son 1^{er} voyage aux environs de Stadaconé, et celle des mots que dans son 2^e voyage il put recueillir en remontant le fleuve Saint-Laurent jusqu'à Hochelaga." After citing a number of examples from these lists and a careful comparison of them with the modern Iroquois, the learned abbé winds up with: "Nous concluons donc . . . qu'au temps de leur découverte, les sauvages habitant les rives du Saint-Laurent parlaient une seule et même langue. . . . Nous bornant à ces exemples, nous pourrions, ce nous semble, tirer déjà notre conclusion et regarder comme une vérité démontrée, que la langue parlée à Stadaconé, à Hochelaga et autres lieux voisins ou intermédiaires, était la langue *iroquoise*." ¹ It is, consequently, with these two forms of Indian language, the Algonkin and the Iroquois, and especially with the latter, that I have chiefly to do here in noting the mingling, or rather lack of mingling, of the French with the native idioms of this part of the North American Continent. I say chiefly, because even among the few words of Indian origin that remain in Canadian French to-day, there are some which do not belong to the domain of native speech whence we might naturally suppose that they would have been taken, and, therefore, in seeking to account for their form or to explain the phonetic changes which these vocables have undergone, we must naturally have recourse to a system of phonetic production and to laws of morphological development that, in certain cases, do not obtain in the special linguistic group with which the French emigrants had immediately to do. The causes that led to the adoption of certain terms drawn from the language of tribes with which the French were not in constant and friendly relation, must be sought, on the one hand, in the unstable social character of the early settlements, where there existed a natural spirit of adventure and conquest which urged the more daring members beyond the confines of the usual tribal territory for the purpose of exploring new domains of wealth, of carrying on a temporary traffic or of establishing regular commercial intercourse, and these brought

¹ Quels étaient les sauvages que rencontra Jacq. Cartier sur les rives du Saint-Laurent? pp. 1, 3, 4. Extrait du Cahier de Septembre 1869, des Annales de Philosophie chrétienne.

back with them, of course, the idioms and names used by the strange people whose customs they had often adopted in part or altogether, and with whom they had associated sometimes for many months without returning to the French settlements. And still another class, the missionaries, did not a little to bring back to the centres of population on the St. Lawrence the peculiar terms and characteristic expressions of distant and heterogeneous tribes to whom they had preached the Gospel and with whom they would labor often for years before seeking their co-workers at St. Marie (Montreal), Three Rivers and Quebec. But, on the other hand, outside of individual enterprise and religious enthusiasm, a still greater channel for the transmission of these allophylian elements was opened in the establishment, with governmental patronage, of powerful fur-trading companies that carried their commercial dealings far into the interior of the country and, through their agents, had necessarily to adopt some of the names used by those with whom their trading operations were practised. We shall see a little further on that the borrowed material, both here and in general, as taken from the native idioms, represents concrete ideas; in truth, usage seldom rises above simple names of things in these loan-words.

After a consideration of the external conditions—social, political and religious¹—that have exercised an abrading, equalizing influence on the discordant, ill-assorted, multifarious elements of French society as represented in the early settlement of New France, we are prepared to move on to a treatment of those special linguistic phenomena that were the natural resultant of a fusion of the complex, varied and heterogeneous ingredients of speech which were brought together in this new civilization. From what has been said we may expect to find here a strong drift toward an amalgamation which, while it shows a certain general sameness in form and in sound product, still, when examined under the microscope of a careful dialect analysis, yields a many-colored material full of variety and puzzling aspects, replete with shadings of linguistic life so delicate that they dissolve from view in the attempt to seize and fix them. The superposition of so many different speech varieties, the crossing and recrossing of this language trait with that other of a wholly diverse nature, the sudden breaking of a line of tradition, the squeezing into a new dress and the refitting of the old material to match it, the warping of well-established laws of development,

¹ See this Journal, Vol. VI, pp. 135-150, and Vol. VII, pp. 141-160.

the requiring of certain grammar categories to perform new functions, the mingling of the old with the new and of the new with the old in language and dialect, sometimes the one predominating, sometimes the other—these are natural results and offer only a few points of view from which the investigator has to scan a material that is still so plastic, so fraught with the element of change, that before he is done handling it he is conscious of the possibility of conditions arising other than those in which he has just considered it.

In view of these difficulties I shall canvass the subject of speech mixture proper in French Canada in a strictly historical manner, beginning with the simplest form and proceeding to the more complex stages that developed with the political changes through which the country went by conquest and by a natural growth of power. This mode of procedure has this evident advantage that, in the beginning of the discussion, many of the perplexing questions are eliminated which naturally come up later when the conditions of the problem become more complicated through the increased number of elements that enter into it. Under this view the subject naturally falls into four parts: The mixture of the French (*a*) with the native Indian speech, (*b*) with imported idioms, such as the English, etc., (*c*) with itself, that is, in its own dialect varieties, (*d*) with different ages of the same. Let us take up (*a*) Mixture of French with the Indian.

The most typical family of North American Indians, "the Indian of Indians," as Parkman calls them, was the Huron-Iroquois stock to which passing reference was made above and whose earliest home was Upper and Lower Canada. They were thus the native historic race of the valley of the St. Lawrence, and at the same time the most aggressive tribe of the North American Continent. The oldest, if not the parent stock of the Huron-Iroquois breed was the Huron branch, and the separation from its consanguineous rival, the Iroquois proper, had already taken place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the French got their foothold in Canada and the Hurons entered with them into that friendly alliance which proved fatal to the savage.¹

¹ Parkman, in one of his inimitable antitheses, happily characterizes the treatment of the Indian by the three chief European nations that acquired possessions in the New World, in the following manner: "Spanish civilization crushed the Indian; English civilization scorned and neglected him; French civilization embraced and cherished him."

According to the opinion of one of the ablest scholars of to-day in Indian lore, "the evidence of language, so far as it has been examined, seems to show that the Huron clans were the older members of the group; and the clear and positive traditions of all the surviving tribes, Hurons, Iroquois, and Tuscaroras, point to the lower St. Lawrence as the earliest known abode of their stock. Here the first explorer, Cartier, found Indians of this stock at Hochelaga and Stadacone, now the sites of Montreal and Quebec."¹

As representatives of refugees from the massacre of 1648, perpetrated by their relentless foes, the Iroquois, the Hurons now constitute a small village, Lorette (near Quebec), the sole surviving remnant of that once powerful tribe which already in the middle of the seventeenth century had ceased to exist.

The language of these various Indian tribes with which the French came into contact, whether in a friendly way or not, was split into numerous and often widely differing dialects that bore, however, the common stamp of the North American vernacular, namely, a complex, polysynthetic character. In the special, holophrastic feature of these native idioms is to be sought one of the principal causes, I think, of the comparatively little mixing of French or of other European languages (for the same is true of the English and the Spanish) with the indigenous speech. We have abundant testimony, from the missionaries of the early settlements on the St. Lawrence, of the enormous difficulty that attached to acquiring even a moderate facility in the use of the native idioms. This must be attributed in part, at least, to the absolute lack of external helps such as grammars, vocabularies, etc., in the prosecution of these studies. The celebrated Père Lejeune, for example, after having studied Algonkin for two years, almost despaired of being able to master it and wrote: "*Ils ont une richesse si importune, qu'elle me jette quasi dans la créance que je serai pauvre toute ma vie en leur langue.*"² Belcourt, another missionary of that time, says: "*C'est l'immense quantité des désinences, rendues nécessaires par le grand nombre des modes dans les verbes, qui produit la richesse et la variété des expressions et qui rend le discours oratoire puissant, noble, cadencé. La mémoire doit faire de grands efforts pour saisir la multitude*

¹ Horatio Hale, *The Iroquois Books of Rites*, Introduction, pp. 10, 11. Cf. Dr. D. G. Brinton's *Library of Aboriginal American Literature*, No. II.

² Cf. Ferland, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada*, p. 96, and *Relation de 1636*, quoted by him.

désespérante de variations dans les verbes.”¹ “The variety of compounds,” wrote the accomplished missionary, Brebeuf, concerning the Huron tongue, “is very great; it is the key to the secret of their language. They have as many genders as ourselves, as many numbers as the Greeks.” Recurring to the same comparison, he remarks of the Huron verb that it has as many tenses and numbers as the Greek, with certain discriminations which the latter did not possess.² And Horatio Hale, the subtle investigator in native American linguistics, already quoted, significantly observes with further reference to the difficulty of learning the Huron-Iroquois: “It is a fact somewhat surprising, as well as unfortunate, that no complete grammar of any of the Huron-Iroquois stock has ever been published. . . . Such is the extraordinary complexity of the language, such the multiplicity of its forms and the subtlety of its distinctions, that years of study are required to master it.”³ The eminent missionary, Cuoq, of Montreal, a profound philologist versed in the grammatical principles of many and widely different languages, confirms these statements when he attempts to trace the outlines of the grammatical system of their respective languages: “Vouloir calquer une grammaire iroquoise ou algonquine sur le modèle d’une grammaire grecque ou hébraïque, russe ou allemande, basque même ou irlandaise, eût été un projet insensé et impossible à accomplir. Il n’y a que les hommes compétents en matière de grammaire et de linguistique qui pourront concevoir la longueur et la difficulté du travail qui va paraître sous leurs yeux; eux seuls pourront se faire une juste idée des perquisitions de tout genre et des diverses combinaisons que nous avons dû faire pour démêler la trame si merveilleuse de ces langues.”⁴ Again, in discussing Cartier’s word-lists, noted above, this scholar observes: “Les légères différences qui peuvent se trouver entre les mots des deux listes ne doivent s’expliquer autrement que par l’extrême difficulté que l’on éprouve toujours, quand il faut saisir par le simple son de la voix, des mots appartenant à une langue complètement inconnue. Cette raison acquiert une force toute spéciale, quand il s’agit, comme dans le cas présent,

¹ Cf. Ferland, *ibidem*, note.

² Library of Aboriginal American Literature, edited by D. G. Brinton, M. D., Philadelphia, 1883, No. II, p. 99. Quoted from “Relation” of 1636, pp. 99, 100.

³ *Ibidem*, p. 100.

⁴ *Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages de l’Amérique* par N. O. (Jean André Cuoq) Ancien Missionnaire. Montréal, 1866, p. 35.

d'une langue sauvage ; nous parlons ici par expérience et en appelons avec assurance au témoignage de ceux qui, comme nous, ont travaillé auprès des sauvages, et ont appris quelqu'une des langues de ces peuples."¹ A curious example of misconceived form, through a false appreciation of sound elements by the ear, has been perpetuated in European languages in the word *totem*, with reference to which this same writer remarks: "Je dois faire observer que *totem* est pour la langue algonquine ce que seraient pour le français des mots du genre de ceux-ci : *thomme, toiseau*; c'est à dire que trompé par la liaison du mot précédent, on a cru qu'il fallait écrire *ni totem, ki totem*, absolument comme quelqu'un qui se guidant iniquement d'après la prononciation, écrirait : *gran thomme, charman toiseau*. Il est à regretter que plusieurs écrivains de mérite aient pu commettre une pareille méprise. Ce n'est ni *totem* ni *dodem*, mais bien *Otem*." Further, a recent writer who had associated with various tribes of our American Indians tells us how many obstacles the stranger has to contend against in acquiring even a passable speaking acquaintance with any given Indian idiom: "The class of the noun determines the class of the verb, so that a speaker, grammatically skilled in the language, must know the appropriate class of each noun, as precisely as the masculine and feminine is required in the French. But there is an additional reason for accuracy in the American languages, for in the French the verb remains unchanged by its operation on the object. From this cause it is exceedingly rare to find the Indian spoken grammatically by any but natives or persons who have been accustomed to the idiom from childhood. We have never known a white man who had attained anything more, in the acquisition of the language, than an approximation to accuracy. The class of persons who visit the interior bands for the purposes of trade are commonly mere smatterers, and totally inadequate to communicate with the Indians on topics of governmental business, or the abstruse questions connected with their religion or history."²

If such, then, were the difficulties for educated minds and for men imbued with a boundless zeal to learn, in order to propagate their religious beliefs, as were these missionaries just referred to,

¹ Cuoq, Quels étaient les sauvages que rencontra Jacques Cartier sur les rives du Saint-Laurent? p. 2.

² The North American Review, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 46. Language of the Algonquins, a review of Gallatin, "On the Languages of North American Indians."

how insuperable must have been the impediments to acquiring the native idioms for the ordinary French peasant and for the common fur-trader, whose intercourse with the natives was not prompted by an enthusiasm for ideal ends, but simply confined to the narrow channel of special business transactions, where a scanty supply of words was adequate to their limited necessities. In such circumstances it would be more natural, perhaps, that the savage should pick up words enough to enable him to barter with the white man, and it is probable, too, that we should find a greater infiltration, for practical purposes, of Gallic elements into Indian speech of this epoch than vice versa; in truth, hints of opposition to this procedure, on the part of the Indian, we have from writers on Canada of the sixteenth century, and, among others, I may cite again the same missionary, Belcourt, who expresses himself in the following terms with reference to the introduction into the native languages of modes of expression conflicting with established usage: "Ces langues sont moins sujettes aux changements que bien des langues écrites. Cela est dû au ridicule qui, parmi les sauvages, s'attache à ceux qui osent innover dans la langue. Les quelques changements introduits depuis trente ans, dans la langue algonquine de l'ouest, l'ont été par des métis qui ont voulu traduire littéralement des expressions françaises, employées d'une manière métaphorique."¹ This aversion to the use of strange constructions is easily conceivable, and particularly that the familiar and striking terms of metaphor should be set in a foreign mould; but for simple, concrete names, analogy with the language products of other savage and semi-civilized peoples would lead me to believe that the foreign elements of this sort were adopted with ease. That the effort of the Frenchman to speak the Indian dialect, to whatever sept it belonged, was necessarily much greater than that required of the savage to make himself understood in French, follows naturally from the testimony, cited above, of scholars who were wont to occupy themselves closely with the native idioms. However, the strong conservative tendencies, contrary to expectation, of some of these idioms that possess few written documents, are well established by the testimony of those most familiar with them: "A comparison of the Iroquois with the Huron grammar shows that after a separation which must have exceeded five hundred years, and has probably covered twice that term, the two languages differ less from one

¹ Ferland, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada*, p. 95, note.

another than the French of the twelfth century differed from the Italian, or than the Anglo-Saxon of King Alfred differed from the contemporary Low German speech.”¹ The characteristics of the Huron language mentioned by the historian Ferland, as drawn from the early missionaries of New France, would serve, in the absence of more positive data, to give us only a very incomplete and incorrect idea as to the effect of the mingling of this idiom with the French: “La plupart des mots de la langue huronne sont composés presque entièrement de voyelles. Cela vient de ce que plusieurs consonnes leur manquent; ainsi ils n’ont pas une seule labiale. Un missionnaire remarquait qu’ils avaient toujours les lèvres séparées, et que, lorsqu’ils parlaient bas, il était impossible de les comprendre, si l’on n’était très-accoutumé à leur langue.”²

This statement is too sweeping if applied exclusively, as the author would seem to intend it should be applied, to the Huron; for, as a matter of fact, the mother tongue of the Huron-Iroquois branch, the Old Huron,³ does preserve in part the labials that have disappeared from all the special Iroquois dialects. “A comparison of any of the Iroquois dialects with the Huron as still spoken by the Wyandots of Ontario, shows the *m* to be in use by the latter.”⁴ And again, the same writer remarks, page 88: “The habit of invariably speaking with the lips open is the source of very curious modifications in the Iroquois vocabularies when compared with that of the Wyandots (the Indian name for Huron). The *m* gives place to *w*, *nw*, *nh*, or *nhu*, also to *ku* and *nkw*, and so frequently changes the whole character of the word by the modifications it gives rise to.” Example, English Mary = Wari, etc. “Il y avait des hommes qui nous demandoient d’apprendre le François avec eux, mais comme en toute leur langue il ne se trouve aucune lettre labiale, ny les une ny les autres n’en pouvoient prononcer une seule que tres difficilement. Pour dire P. ils disoient T. Pour F. S., & pour M. N., &c., & par ainsi il leur

¹ Cf. Horatio Hale, *The Iroquois Book of Rites*, p. 113. Dr. Brinton’s *Library of Aboriginal American Literature*, Vol. II.

² Ferland, *Cours d’Histoire du Canada*, p. 95.

³ The Huron speech became the Iroquois tongue in the form in which it is spoken by the Caniengas, or Mohawks (*Horatio Hale, The Iroquois Book of Rites*, p. 13).

⁴ Cf. Daniel Wilson, *The Huron-Iroquois of Canada*, a typical Race of American Aborigines. *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for 1884*, Section II, p. 55 sq.

eut esté comme impossible de la pouvoir apprendre dans leur país (l'entends les personnes aagées) qu'avec une grand longueur de temps & des peines indicibles, & suis asseuré qu'un jeune garçon Huron s'efforça deux ou trois cens fois pour pouvoir prononcer la lettre P. & ne pû iamaïs dire que T, car voulant dire Pere Gabriel il disoit T. Aueil."¹ It seems, therefore, a distinction must be made between the Iroquois, as such, and the Huron in the use of labials, but, in another part of their phonetics, they do agree as to a treatment that must have deeply affected the physiognomy of the French vocables added to their word-supply: "In none of the Huron-Iroquois dialects is any distinction made between *o* (guttural) and *u* (guttural); *k* (*g*) of other dialects is frequently softened to phonetic *j* in Huron: *canocha* (house) *janoñsha*, *canada* (town) *jandāta*, *cohenā* (island) *jawenda*, etc.; in none of the special Iroquois languages are *dt*, or *gk*, *ou* separated, and consequently the French missionaries represent these sounds by simple *t*, *k*, *o*."² It was not alone, however, the greater simplicity within certain well-defined groups of sounds, such as the guttural, the dental, etc., that marked these idioms and had a generalizing, levelling effect upon the differences of French phonetic production circumscribed by generic lines, but, according to Cuq, who, besides valuable contributions to other Indian dialects, wrote a grammar of the Iroquois and a "Lexique de la langue Iroquoise," less than half the French alphabet is required to represent faithfully the phonic varieties which he found in this particular family of Indian speech; namely, *a*, *e*, *f*, *h*, *i*, *k*, *n*, *o*, *r*, *s*, *t*, *w*. In this author's *Études philologiques sur quelques Langues sauvages de l'Amérique*, especially the Second Part containing a treatment of the *Système grammatical des langues algonquine et iroquoise*, we find a clear presentation of this subject, which, though far from being exhaustive, gives reliable data touching these idioms and excels anything else of this sort that we possess. We may hope for more material and better opportunity to study the Iroquois when the works now in preparation shall have been finished.³

¹ Histoire du Canada et voyages que les freres mineurs Recollects y ont faicts pour le conuersion des infidelles diuisez en quatre liures fait et composé par le F. Gabriel Sagard Theodat, Mineur Recollect de la Province de Paris. à Paris 1636, Vol. II, pp. 330-31.

² Daniel Wilson, *ibidem*, pp. 78, 102.

³ For the work of Mrs. E. A. Smith, of Jersey City, in the preparation of a series of chrestomathies of the Iroquois language, see first annual report of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1879-80, by J. W. Powell, Director, p. xxi.

According to the scheme proposed by Cuoq, the following sounds, *b, c, g, j, l, m, p, q, u, v, x, y, z*, are wanting in the Iroquois; that is, the labial group is reduced to the single voiceless fricative (labio-dental) *f*; the guttural vowels fall to two (*a, o*); liquids have one representative only instead of two; of the nasals, only dental *n* sticks; guttural consonants are reduced to one-third of their French signs and dental sibilants fall to one-third. The following comparative table will show the simplicity which is thus reached by the use of only twelve signs instead of the French twenty-five:

VOWELS.		CONSONANTS.	
	<i>Iroquois.</i>	<i>French.</i>	
Guttural	<i>a, o</i>	<i>a, o, u</i>	<i>k</i>
Palatal	<i>e, i</i>	<i>e, i (y), ö, ü</i>	wanting <i>ñ</i>
Labial			<i>f, w</i>
Dental			<i>s, t, r, n</i>
			<i>d, t, z, s, ž, š, r, l, n</i>
			and voiceless <i>h</i> .

With so simple a phonetic system as this it is evident at a glance what serious disturbance in form and sound the French language must have undergone in the mouth of the natives (the Iroquois) along the St. Lawrence. But with another member of the long-lived Iroquois league, the Mohawks, the French were brought into contact, and, according to Max Müller, their language has no labials of any kind: "It is a fact that the Mohawks never, either as infants or as grown-up people, articulate with their lips. They have no *p, b, m, f, v, w*."¹ In commenting upon this statement, President Wilson observes that Dr. Oronhyatekha, the native Mohawk who had given the Oxford professor this information, goes even further, rejecting not only the six letters already mentioned, but also *c, g, l, z*, and thus reduces the alphabet for this dialect to sixteen letters.² Now, it will be a matter of great interest, when these native dialects shall be properly worked up, to observe whether any, or how much, trace of French influence is manifest in them respectively, and how deeply the Gallic speech has been affected by the loss of sound and flexion so necessary to suit it to practical use in these idioms. Our present knowledge of the native languages of the St. Lawrence Valley at the time of the arrival of the French is not sufficient to enable us to trace with accuracy the speech mixture on the Indian side. That there

¹ Lectures on the Science of Language, 2d series, p. 162.

² Daniel Wilson, l. c., pp. 87-8.

has been no permanent borrowing is manifest in the language of the Huron colony of Lorette (New Quebec), where they have been in contact with Europeans since the establishment of the French colony at Quebec and yet their speech does not show strongly marked signs of deterioration. From a linguistic point of view there is more poetry than truth in Parkman's statement: "Here (Lorette) to this day the tourist finds the remnant of a lost people, harmless weavers of baskets and sewers of moccasins, the Huron blood fast bleaching out of them, as, with every generation, they mingle and fade away in the French population around."¹

Let us now proceed to a consideration of the chief phonetic and morphological features that characterize the few examples which I have been able to collect of the process of amalgamation of Indian and French. It is evident that this mixture may take place in two directions: we have the products of the dialect in the mouth of the Frenchman, or those of the French language in the mouth of the savage, and, as hinted above, since we may expect *a priori* that the more complicated and perplexing grammatical relations of the savage idiom would render the employment of the foreign language, in the first case, more limited than the conditions imposed of passing in practical use from the more involved to the simple grammar machinery in the second case, I shall start with examining the traces of Indian transferred to the French, since the material preserved to us here is confined to only a few words, which, however, possess a strong interest for us, since they represent thoroughly popular usage. It is a curious fact, worthy of note in this connection, that though these Indian dialects possess an abundant vocabulary for the detailed and accurate expression of abstract ideas, and though their writings deal largely in metaphor and simile, yet not a single example of such usage, so far as I know, is to be found among the vocables that have lived in French. One would naturally expect, I think, that in their extended, constant and varied relations with the numerous missionaries scattered through the different tribes, and particularly since these pioneers of the Christian faith were unremittingly occupied with the presentation of spiritual truths and the discussion of the finer aspects of a new religion, there would be left in the language some impress of this life; but with the exception of a

¹ Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 432-3.

single term, to be noted below, all evidences of this extensive relation have vanished, if they ever existed, and we are restricted in forming our judgment of the borrowing by the European language, to a meagre list of commonplace terms representing a very limited range of thought. We shall find, on the contrary, that the Indian has accepted many terms and modes of expression from the missionary. This would naturally arise for the description of all such Church functions and relations as were not easily translatable into the native dialect; transliteration being very common with them to express those religious rites that were totally unknown to the savage mind, such as the confession, for example, and for which there existed either no equivalents at all, or so inadequate verbal representations of the ceremony that the words possible for this use were without special significance. In these cases, therefore, the foreign vocable was adopted bodily after having undergone the peculiar phonetic and morphological changes that characterized the speech of each given dialect.

We shall first take the individual words adopted by the French. A few of these are equally common both to English and to French usage; for example:

TOMAHAWK (Algonkin *tomehagen*, Mohegan *tumnahegan*, Delaware *tamoihecan*), "a kind of war hatchet used by the American Indians."¹ A writer in the *North American Review*, Vol. XLV, p. 55, assigns this word, without comment, to the Mohegan, but the nearer approach of the adopted form to the Algonkin type would naturally suggest this dialect as the more direct source of the word. The spelling with *w* would seem to indicate that the Canadians have taken it from the English. In the early missionary records, however, it is spelled with *ou*, so that the present mode of writing it might represent simply a later stage of graphic sign usage. I do not find it recorded in any of the small vocabularies that contain special Canadian words.

MOCASSIN (Algonkin *makisin*.) "Châteaubriand parle de Mocassines de peau de rat musqué, brodées avec du poil de porc-épic(?) Le mocassin est un soulier de peau de chevreuil, ou d'original, sans semelle, avec des demi-guêtres qu'on assujétit au dessus du pied avec des courrois."² The writer referred to above (*N. Am. Rev.*) attributes also this word to the Mohegan.

¹ Cf. Webster's English Dictionary, s. v.

² Glossaire Franco-Canadien par Oscar Dunn, Quebec, 1880, s. v.

WIGWAM (Algonkin *mikišam*, "house").¹ This word has probably come into European languages subject to some Huron or Huron-Iroquois influence, since the initial labial *m* has been replaced by the voiced bilabial *w*; and the use of this graphic sign would further point to the English as the medium through which it had reached the French, unless, as in *tomahawk*, it represents simply a more recent spelling.

Outside of these words, common to both English and French usage, we may possibly find a couple of dozen that belong exclusively to the French. Of course, in this enumeration, proper names, especially geographical designations, are left out of account, since they form a class to themselves, and are very abundant in certain parts of the lower provinces of Canada. It would be an interesting, instructive study to collect these striking and often *bilderreiche* topographical names and to seek their sources in the pictorial imagination of the rude savage. Nowhere else, perhaps, in the whole range of language have the figures of prosopopoeia and antonomasia been more successfully and beautifully applied in the creation of special appellations. For the present, then, I shall omit any reference to these subtle formations, as I hope at some time in the future to treat them in a separate chapter on specific Indian-French onomatology.

Before proceeding to a consideration, individually, of the vocables here presented, I will give them in alphabetical order according to a list made up by me and supplemented by two Canadian French writers² whose critical and accurate knowledge of their language is not excelled by that of any of their colleagues to-day. This list, as is seen, covers but nineteen specimens, and these, with only one or two exceptions, are simple names of things, or, in other words, plain terms representing concrete ideas. The number is a little longer than it was thought possible to find when we

¹ Cf. Cuoq, *Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages*, p. 42. The sign *š* = Eng. *w*. For a curious derivation of this word from a form *wēkowom-ut*, see Webster's Dictionary, s. v. *Wēkowom-ut* is here supposed to be an Algonkin locative case, whereas Cuoq gives the true locative *mikišam-ing* (cf. l. c.).

² I refer to the celebrated historian and poet, Mr. Benjamin Sulte, of Ottawa, whose numerous works have thrown great light on the early history of La Nouvelle France, and to the graceful poet, novelist, and writer on language, Mr. Napoleon Legendre, of Quebec, whose polished and chaste diction has won for him the enviable reputation of being one of the best stylists of his country.

began our quest of these strangers in the French language of Canada. Mr. Sulte wrote me at that time, after jotting down all of them that he could find: "Peut-être existe-t'il parmi nous d'autres expressions sauvages, je vais tâcher de m'en assurer. Si je puis former, en tout, une liste de quinze de ces mots ce sera le plus possible." As intimated above, the number may likely yet be increased by a very few words of infrequent use, but we certainly have by far the bulk of them: *babiche*, *Manitou*, *matachias*, *micouenne* (*micouane*), *micmac*, *mitasse*, *nugâne*, *ouaouaron* (*wawaron*), *oualamiche* (*walamiche*), *ouragan*, *pagaie* (?), *petun*, *pictou*, *picouille*, *piroque*, *saccacomi*, *sagamité*, *sacaqua* (*sassaqua*), *tobogan*. The origin of some of these, that is, the determination of their exact meaning and of the particular dialect to which any given etymon belongs, I have been able in certain cases to settle for myself, while in others I have received valuable assistance from Dr. Daniel G. Brinton, of Philadelphia (Professor of American Linguistics and Archaeology in the University of Pennsylvania), whose numerous researches in native American lore and whose untiring investigations in Indian speech have revealed to us a spirit-life hitherto unsuspected among the aborigines of this continent, and constituted him an authority to whom the scholar turns with great pleasure when dealing in these matters.

If we now take up these words severally we have:

BABICHE.—(From the Algonkin verbal ending *-bij*, "to tie."—Dr. Brinton.) Mr. Legendre, in referring to this term, says: "There is the word *babiche*, which means a string cut from a raw hide and used by our *habitants* in making their shoes." Mr. Dunn, *Glossaire Franco-Canadien*, states the same in other words: "En canadien pop., Lanières de peau de mouton, de chevreuil, de caribou ou d'original, avec lesquelles on coud les souliers sans semelle faits à domicile." Mr. Legendre continues and gives an interesting case of misconception of this word on the part of English boys: "But what is curious about it is that our boys give it out as an insult to their English comrades; they cry out *Tu sens la babiche*, and the English boy will invariably take it for 'Tu es un son of a bitch,' inde irae."

MANITOU.—Algonkin, "Génie" (Spirit, God). This is the most common strictly proper name in our list, but its meaning has been so extended in Canadian speech as to signify *génie* in general. In his criticism of Henry R. Schoolcraft's work entitled "The Indian in his Wigwam," Mr. Cuoq, dealing with this word, shows that

none of the dialects write *Monedo*, or *Maneto*, or even the correct form *Manito*, which latter can have this transcription only when preceded by the adjective *kije* "great," with the double signification of "great" and "good"—*kije Manito*, "le grand et le bon génie." He adds, however, in a note: "Le mot 'Manito' s'emploie pourtant quelquefois sans être précédé de '*kije*,' mais seulement en poésie, et dans ce cas, il est employé par antonomase." The French have seized upon the simple word irrespective of its attributive qualifier *kije*, and made it their own by extending and generalizing the signification.

MATACHIAS.—"Rassades dont on orne les habits des sauvages" (Sulte).

MICOUENNE or MICOUANE.—*Cri*: From *Mikkiw*, to use a sharpened flat bone for scraping fat from a skin, etc. (Dr. Brinton). Cuillère de bois, plutôt grande que petite (Sulte). A kind of wooden spoon (Legendre). Dunn gives the following: Grande cuillère de bois, qu'on emploie généralement pour tirer le pot-au-feu du chaudron, et, dans le peuple, pour servir la soupe. C'est la *mouvette* des Normands.

MICMAC.—Here, again, we have a proper name, so extended in meaning as to have become a general term. The Micmacs were an eastern tribe living to the north of the Bay of Fundy, along the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Bay of Gaspé, etc.). "The dialects of those three eastern nations, the Micmacs, the Etchemins and the Abenakis, have great affinities with each other, but, though evidently belonging to the same stock, differ widely from the Algonkin language. They were all early converted by the Jesuits, remained firmly attached to the French, and, till the conquest of Canada, were in an almost perpetual state of hostility with the British colonists. In the year 1754, all the Abenakis, with the exception of the Penobscots, withdrew to Canada."¹ It was from this fact that the Micmacs fought so bravely on the side of the French in their struggle against the English, which caused their name to be handed down as a perpetual souvenir of their bloody deeds, and to-day, *il y a du micmac là dedans* signifies in Canadian

¹ Cf. Gallatin, Albert, "A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes within the United States, east of the Rocky Mountains and in the British and Russian Possessions in North America," published in "Archæologia Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society," Vol. II, p. 32. Likewise the detailed "Map of the Indian Tribes of North America about 1600 A. D. along the Atlantic," appended to this extensive essay of 264 pp.

speech : There's fire and the sword, there's destruction in it (referring to any given undertaking or enterprise) ; *il fait du micmac* : he brings destruction into everything. Dunn adds the more recent and at present more common meaning, "embarras," "intrigue" : Il y a bien du micmac dans cette affaire. Cf. his Glossaire Franco-Canadien, sub voce.

MITASSE.—Cri, *'itas*, or *mitas*, a legging (Dr. Brinton). Sulte remarks : "Ce sont (*mitasses*) des bas à la sauvage. Autrement dit, une sorte de guêtre, très ornée. On les fait avec du cuir souple, ou du drap. C'est très élégant." And Dunn gives the same idea in the following terms : "Guêtre en peau de chevreuil ou en drap, ornée de dessins de rassades ou de poil d'original de différentes couleurs."

NUGÂNE (origin ?), a cradle (Legendre).

OUAOUARON, or WAWARON, Huron *ouaron*, crapaux vers (Sagard). The missionary Sagard notes this word under the general heading "Bestes à quatre pieds" in his Dictionnaire de la langue Huronne (Paris, 1632), added to his extensive work on the history of Canada.¹ This word is evidently a purely onomatopoeic creation, and Dunn remarks, after defining it as "grosse grenouille verte," on dit qu'il *beugle*, et les Anglais l'appellent Bull-frog, grenouille-boeuf.

OUALAMICHE, or WALAMICHE (origin ?), A kind of salmon in Lake St. John (Legendre).

OURAGAN (origin ?), Cassot ou vase fait d'écorce d'arbre (Sulte).

PAGAIE (origin ?), A paddle (Legendre). Mr. Legendre places an interrogation mark after this word, showing that he is doubtful whether the popular judgment is correct in attributing its source to the savage speech.

PETUN (origin ?). The word *Petun*, which was the Indian name for tobacco, is still in use in some parts of the country ; I have even heard *pétuner* instead of *fumer* (Legendre).²

PICHOU (origin ?), Nom d'un être laid ou malin. "Laid comme un pichou" (Sulte).

PICOUILLE (origin ?), Animal maigre à l'excès (Sulte).

¹ Histoire du Canada, etc., cited under 17, constitutes Vol. IV.

² This name, The Tobacco Nation (*Nation du Petun*), was given by the French, and probably also by the Algonkins, to one of the Huron tribes, the Tionontates, noted for the excellent tobacco which they raised and sold. Cf. Horatio Hale, l. c., pp. 171, 172, appendix, note A.

PIROQUE (origin?). In answer to an inquiry as to whether the Canadian French use the word *canoe* as well as *wigwam* and *tomahawk*, common to the English, Mr. Legendre replied: "We never use *canoe*, but we always use *canot*. The difference between us and the Français de France is, that we have the word only with the signification of *piroque*, and, they often make use of it with the same meaning as *chaloupe*. *Piroque* is an Indian word françaisé." From this it is evident that the Indian term is strictly equivalent in meaning to the English *canoe*.

SACCACOMI, from *sakav*, to light by fire, *sakaipwagane*, to light a pipe (Dr. Brinton). Une plante des forêts du Canada, de la hauteur de celle que nous appelons 'petit tobac de Virginie.' Lorsque Cartier et plus tard Champlain arrivèrent en Canada, les sauvages fumaient cette plante. Encore aujourd'hui, bon nombre de nos habitans la fument et ils lui donnent toujours son nom sauvage pour la distinguer du tobac proprement dit (Sulte).

SAGAMITÉ is, I know, Algonkin, but I cannot put my hand on the original form (Dr. Brinton). Bouillie de blé d'Inde (Sulte). Mr. Legendre uses bouillie de maïs.

SACAQUA, or SACAQUÉ (origin?), Bruit, hurlement, tapage: Faire un sacaqua insupportable (Sulte). Dunn spells the word *sasqua*: "Faire la sasqua."

TOBOGAN, *Cri* Otobanask, traîneau (Dr. Brinton). Mr. Sulte spells it *tobagane* and gives as definition: traîneau sans patines, fait d'une planche mince et recourbée par un bout. Mr. Legendre writes *tobogan*. In the Supplement, Vol. III, of Webster's Dictionary, s. v., is made the usual general statement that characterizes the explanations in this work of all these Indian words: toboggan—corruption of American Indian *Odabogan*, sled.¹

If we now turn to the other side of our subject, to a consideration of the linguistic products resulting from the use of French by the natives, we shall find that the material is much more abundant and varied than that incorporated into the French, and that the deviation from the original type is naturally in accordance with the simple phonetic system of each Indian dialect. A notable difference is further to be remarked between the foreign material taken

¹ In this list, all the words marked (origin?), with the exception of *piroque*, are thought by Dr. Brinton to belong to Algonkin roots, either *Cri* or "Old Algonkin," but as I have not access to Lacombe, *Lexique de la langue des Cris*, or to Cuoq's *Lexique Algonquin*, I am unable, at present, to determine more specifically their particular dialect etymons.

up by the European idiom and that in the Indian dialect ; namely, not only words but phrases of Gallic origin are freely used, and in the former we shall find the same power of combination which characterizes Romance speech in the manipulation of Germanic stems, that is, foreign roots with Indian formative and grammatical elements appended. These are used with both the verb and the nomen series, and that they should be found here shows a power of adaptation and a tendency to speech mixture of which the French did not avail itself in like circumstances, but for linguistic causes of a totally different nature. Possessing a language with a grammatical machinery so much more simple than the savage, and this form of speech being fully established by a long tradition of abundant literary composition, these circumstances, together with the natural and inevitable influence of a stage of superior civilization, must have exercised a marked effect upon all the relations of the earlier settlers of Canada with their savage neighbors and, particularly on the side of language, have had a strong conservative tendency. It was the familiar and simple instrument, easily handled by its users, whether native or foreign, brought into competition with an exceedingly complicated and strange implement, whose most elementary workings were wholly foreign to anything that the common European had ever seen. Furthermore, it is but consistent with the monotony of his daily occupation, the limited range of his experience, the undeveloped state of what might be called his commercial intercourse, the lack of free social life, his naturally taciturn disposition, the innate jealousy as to his own interests and suspicion as to the intentions and actions of the white man, that the ordinary savage should have used as limited a vocabulary as possible with the French *habitant*, and that the latter should, in consequence, have preserved only a few bare traces of the strange languages, and that these should be restricted almost entirely to the names of such utensils or objects of savage use as were unknown to Europeans. This fact is significant, it seems to me, in an estimate of the degree of relation that prevailed between the two races here brought together, and goes far to prove that contact with the natives on the part of the French was generally of a superficial nature. I am aware that the mixture of French and Indian blood has produced the well-known class of *métis*, half-breeds, members of which are found here and there throughout Canada, but these are comparatively few in numbers, and play a very insignificant rôle when placed in contrast with the

great body of natives who came within the reach and power of European civilization. To these *métis*, however, I would attribute, for the most part, the special influence under which French vocabularies and modes of speech have been incorporated into the native idiom in a manner now to be noticed. To recall, first, what has been said above with reference to the phonetics of the Iroquois, we have the following practical examples: Antipathy to the use of labial nasal *m*, in *Sishe* (for Michel), for which the legitimate bilabial *w* has been substituted. But this is not exclusively the case, as is seen in *Tier* (for Pierre), where the dental mute has supplanted the labial mute. These two words in some other dialects, for instance in the Algonkin, hold nearer to the original in the preservation of the initial labial, but here again we find a special aversion to the dental liquid element as a final, e. g. *Micen* (Michel), *Pien* (Pierre), *Pon* (Paul). Other examples, showing like phonetic characteristics, we have in *Sesin* (Cécile), *Basin* (Basile), and for medial *r*, *l*, *Mani* (Marie), *Anjenik* (Angélique), *Annemon* (Allemand).

Simple assibilation of the voiced dental fricative *j* (*ž*) we have in Iroquois *Soset* (Joseph), where it is doubtful whether the initial sibilant is voiced or voiceless. The missionary Cuq, from whose "Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages" this example is taken (p. 90), counts the sign *s* in his system of transcription as always voiceless, and expressly states this on page 9: "Ainsi *S* et *T* gardent toujours leur son propre, comme en Grec et en Hébreu, et jamais ne s'adouissent comme en français," but, in this very word, there can be no doubt that the medial *s* sibilant is regularly represented in Cuq's system by *z*. Our doubts are further aroused as to the exactness of the notation when, a few lines below, we read: "Le *C* algonquin se prononce à l'italienne, c'est-à-dire comme *ch* français ou *sh* anglais" (sic!). This *s* is used as an equivalent of *ss* in cassé (carreau cassé = karo kase) in illustration of the Iroquois (p. 10), but in the Algonkin we have *Jozep* (Joseph), where the quality of the medial sibilant is surely the same as in *Soset* (Joseph). The same sign, *s*, if the notation can be trusted for the initial, is thus used for both voiced and voiceless fricative (*ž*, *č*), since *Sarot* represents the French *Charlotte* (p. 90), and we have here, consequently, a reduction of two original sounds to a single equivalent of a different grade. Whether this generalization is universal for the Iroquois, I have no means of accurately determining. According

to further representations of these two species of sounds by other writers,¹ no distinction was made between them by the Algonkin tribes; but, instead of using, as their equivalent, the pure sibilant, they have the voiceless fricative *š*, which, if pronounced in strict accordance with the English *š* (*sh*), has of course changed quality: Auch die französ. *ch*, *j* sind wohl mit gesenkter Zungenspitze gebildet, die norddeutschen und englischen *š* aber mit gehobener Zungenspitze.² No discrimination between English *sh* and French *ch* is evidently thought of, therefore, in the transcription of the two examples given below as drawn from the Algonkin: "While, as we have seen, the Mohegans have adopted words from the European nations with whom they, for upwards of three centuries, lived in close contact, the Algonkin tribes have evinced either similar wants, by adopting and incorporating into their language several words from the French, as the following:

Bosho, from Bon jour.

Mushwa, from Mouchoir."³

But it would seem that it is not alone the French *ž* (*j*) and *š* (*ch*) which are given by the English sounds *sh*, according to this writer, but even, in certain cases, the simple *s* must be thus represented, as in the example quoted by him (l. c.), *Ishpio* for *Espagnol*. Here, probably, it is the following labial (*p*) that has influenced the pronunciation, just as in the characteristic Low German combination *sp* = *šp* in the High German pronunciation of South Germany to-day. As to the gutturals, the various graphic signs and combinations of signs in French find their legitimate transcription in a simple form; as, for example, in the representation of all voiceless gutturals, whether simple or complex, the *k* is sufficient, and we have in Algonkin, therefore, for French *Jacques* the rational *Jak*. So, too, in the example given above, *Anjenik*, the *ik* reproduces the French termination *-ique*. Again, in *zotik*, for French *zotique*, we have the same.

For the representation of the dental class by a single sign (here, mute for sonant), we have the name *Herotiat* in the example: *Kaiatase onistenha Herotiat konšaiatskše* ("la mère de la fille s'appelait Hérodiade").

We have here some striking examples of speech mixture where not only Indian and French elements enter into combination, but

¹ Cf. North American Review, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 55.

² Sievers, Grundzüge der Phonetik, p. 104.

³ Cf. North American Review, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 55.

even a third one, the English, is added, and all three are welded together in one compound so as to make it difficult sometimes to separate them; as a rule, however, the process of agglutination is so loosely carried out that the component parts of the new product may be easily recognized. More striking still is the combining of two foreign elements, not belonging to the same language and neither of which is Indian, into a single vocable which is afterward manipulated by the natives with all the ease and accuracy that characterize home-made forms. We have thus four distinct stages of amalgamation, namely: 1. The French or English word used entire. 2. French word or words + Indian flexion. 3. English word + Indian flexion. 4. French word + English word = Indian. The first class includes such simple forms as *enska shiron* (un shilling), *enskat ons* (une once), *enskat minut* (une minute), *enska kateron* (un quarteron), *enska karen* (un gallon). The form *kac* (cachele) is "une rencontre purement fortuite" according to Cuq;¹ such forms as *sakut* "sugar," *pepun* "pepper," *waiskuk* "whiskey," *hummun* "hammer," and, if we follow popular tradition, the curious *Yangeese* (Yankees), imperfect Indian pronunciation of the word "English,"² from the English; and *aik* "vinegar," *saugh* "saw," *tubok* "tobacco," from the Dutch, show that words were adopted in the savage idioms promiscuously from whatever foreign languages they chanced to come into contact. It naturally happens that these alien forms, when taken up into one dialect, sometimes pass to others, and at each transfer undergo certain phonetic or morphological changes necessary to adapt them to easy use in the dialects, respectively, where they find a new home. As chief characteristics for these migrations of speech elements, "change of accent is the first innovation, in the words of kindred tribes and families separated from each other. The interchangeable consonants next feel the effects of the separation. The letters *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*, *l* and *n*, *v* and *f*, etc., change places. Vowels next feel the power of change; the long become short, the broad diphthongal, etc. Oral syllabication is miserably performed, where there are no alphabetical signs to fix the sounds."³ This would account for the fact that the same word often has great variations

¹ Jugement erroné de M. Ernest Renan sur les langues sauvages. Deuxième édition, p. 68.

² North American Review, Vol. IX (1819), p. 167. (Review of Hackwelder's Indian History.)

³ North American Review, XLV, p. 41.

in pronunciation and spelling with the natives themselves; as, *Kanieke*, *Kanyenke*, *Canyangeh*, *Canienga*, the name adopted by Mr. Hale for the Mohawks;¹ and, again, in such contractions as *kuligatisches*, according to ordinary pronunciation, for *kiwulitwich-gatisches*.² Schoolcraft, too, whose extensive practical experience with the Indians entitles him to be heard in all matters of pronunciation, however awry he may be in his etymologies, specially remarks how "barbarous nations *mouth* sound and exercise a great range of enunciation, producing changes."³

We have examples under No. 2 in the Algonkin *kopese8*, *i* (se confesser), which has given a number of derivatives in the language, such as *kopese8i8in* (la confession), *kopesendamagan* (confessional), *kopesendamage8in* (l'action de confesser), *kopesendamago8in* (confession entendu), etc. Again, *anamens-ikan* (autel) from *anamensike* (il dit la messe) = a compound locution developed out of the formula *à la messe*.⁴

In the third class may be cited the following forms produced by hanging on to the foreign vocable the locative affix *-ing*: chamber, chamber *-ing* ("in the chamber"), bowl, bowl *-ing* ["in (the) bowl"], table, table *-ing* ["on (the) table"],⁵ where, of course, there has been no attempt made at a phonetic writing of the root word. These are perfect counterparts of a large number of forms that we shall find incorporated into the French from the English, when we come to that French-English speech mixture. This process is common to all language amalgamation; the natural result of long and uninterrupted contact with a more civilized people, as in the case before us, would be a tendency on the part of the savage to adopt its language material without any essential change of form, and then, in accordance with the peculiar morphological laws that obtain for the Indian idiom, to apply its formative elements to the strange matter which is thus brought within the circle of familiar grammar categories. The coalescence of these alien speech forms with the characteristic inflexions of the savage idiom, often takes place after strong modifications in the original phonetic factors of the European word. These effects are

¹ Horatio Hale, l. c., p. 172, appendix, note A.

² Am. Quarterly Review, Vol. III (1828), p. 398. (Review of Zeisberger's Grammar of the Language of the Lanni-Lenape, or Delaware Indians.)

³ Cf. Notes on the Iroquois; or Contributions to American History, Antiquities and General Ethnology, p. 383.

⁴ Cf. Cuoq, Jugement erroné de M. Ernest Renan, etc., p. 39.

⁵ Cf. North American Review, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 57.

the result almost entirely of an imperfect comprehension of the component sound-elements when rapidly uttered, or of the slurred and slovenly pronunciation prevalent among the common people.

To our third class may be assigned the unique and interesting compound *rakšinn*, formed by a union of the French feminine article *la* with the English word *queen*,¹ the locution thus created from two foreign sources being then adopted as a legitimate product by the Iroquois.

But it is not only through the phonology and morphology peculiar to the Indian dialects that we find an influence exerted upon the French to produce variation from the original type; in the sentence taxis, also, according to Indian fashion, the French of the fifteenth century must have had to undergo changes that did violence to the tradition of the time, but some of which would have found a more natural place in the constructions of the language two or three centuries earlier. Thus, for example, the absence in Algonkin of a relational word corresponding to the French preposition *de*, to express the personal genitive, must have puzzled the French peasants who may have tried to reproduce their thoughts after the manner of their savage neighbors; for example, *Pien o masinaigan* = Pierre il livre (son livre) instead of *le livre de Pierre*. *Il* here is the third personal pronoun used as an equivalent of the possessive third person.

Again, if we take the simple direct constructions represented by the following elementary sentences, we shall appreciate how strange must have seemed to the European ear such a word-arrangement as the Indians use, even though the hearer may have understood the full meaning of each vocable: *Jean o sakih-AN Kije Manito-N* = Jean il aime le: Grand Manito ("Jean aime le Grand Génie"); *Panansa8e o takon-AN 8agoc-AN* = François il saisit le: renard ("François saisit le renard"); or, again, the simple idea of the personal genitive in the Iroquois, *Rakšinn akonistenha* = Reine sa mère ("la mère de la Reine"); the Algonkin *Bazin o pakite8-AN Pien-AN o k8isis-INI* = Basile il frappe le: Pierre il fils ("Basile frappe le fils de Pierre").

In the last example, the third personal pronoun *o* before the noun (*k8isis*) plays the rôle of possessive pronoun, as in our first example; in the other cases, before the verb, it has its legitimate value as a pronoun. These are plain illustrations and yet they

¹ Cf. Cuoq, *Études philologiques*, p. 145.

indicate very forcibly how unwieldy the savage mould of thought must have been for any Frenchman who may have attempted to use it, even in the most trivial matters of business. It would appear next to impossible, in view of so absolutely divergent turns of expression, that the learner could ever have passed through the "translation stage" commonly reckoned in acquiring a foreign tongue. The translation of his thought into the outlandish idiom, with the fitting and adjusting necessary to reach the comprehension of his hearers, would doubtless have been far more perplexing in acquiring such languages than the direct recasting of his mental processes according to the model before him. In this must we seek, as remarked above, one of the principal causes why so few traces of the Indian idioms have lived in French. It was comparatively easy to adopt native words, singly and alone, without any regard to the *ius et norma loquendi* of the Indian dialects, and yet how scanty is this foreign coin! Its current value evidently depended almost entirely upon the total absence in Gallic speech of any adequate home staple to draw on for such uses, and, when accepted, the domestic stamp was put on the coin before it was allowed free circulation.

A. M. ELLIOTT.